





# A C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY

OF THE

**DIOCESE OF GUIANA**

AT THE PRIMARY VISITATION

IN APRIL MDCCCXLIII.

BY

WILLIAM PIERCY,

LORD BISHOP OF GUIANA.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY.

DEMERARA:

J. M. F. DODGSON, AMERICA-STREET. J. C. F. AND J. RIVINGTON,  
WATERLOO-PLACE, LONDON.

---

1843.

A. CHAVEZ

THE CLERGY

DIOCESE OF GUAYAMA

AT THE THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL

MEETING OF THE

CLERGY OF THE

DIocese of Guayama

HELD AT THE

CHURCH OF

ST. JAMES THE APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST

RECORDS

OF THE

DEMOCRACY

PRINTED BY J. M. F. DODGSON.

TO THE CLERGY  
OF THE DIOCESE OF GUIANA  
THIS CHARGE  
PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST  
IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED

BY  
THEIR FAITHFUL FRIEND AND BROTHER,

W. P. GUIANA.





## THE CHARGE.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

In meeting you, for the first time, as your Diocesan, I can assure you that my feelings are of a most conflicting character : on the one hand, I know that it is my duty, leaning on the Divine arm for support, to enter fearlessly on the labors which necessarily devolve upon me as Bishop of this Diocese : on the other hand, I am painfully conscious of the responsibility which I incur in undertaking the administration of the affairs of the Church in this important Colony, and of the strict account which I must hereafter render at the Tribunal of God. When Her Majesty's intention of raising me to this dignity was communicated to me, it became a very serious question whether I should accept it ; but after much solemn reflection, I could not avoid the conclusion, that after a long residence in the Colony, and after having been your Archdeacon for a considerable period, and being consequently well ac-

my duty no less than my privilege, to endeavour by all means in my power, to carry into effect those plans, which he had entertained, and which, I trust, are only for a season suspended by his retirement from his important charge, which he administered with so much ability and zeal during the lengthened space of eighteen years. More I need not add respecting our late Diocesan: but less I could not say, having acted as his Archdeacon for several years, and being now appointed his successor in this Diocese. It was not possible to enter upon this my Primary Charge, without alluding to one, to whom, I as an individual, the Clergy in particular, and the Colony in general, owe so much. May his life be spared for many years—and may other fields of usefulness be opened for him in the Mother Country!

I now turn to matters of more public and general interest.

On entering upon my important charge, it is a gratification to me to know, that the Clergy are anxious that the services of the Church should be performed, in every parish, with regularity, order, and decency, in accordance with the *Rubrics* and *Canons*. “Let all things be done decently and in order” is an Apostolic precept; applicable to all times and places, and under all circumstances. Our wise and pious Reformers have left



us a *Ritual* purified from the corrupt additions of the Church of Rome, but in strict conformity with the primitive pattern : and for a Clergyman to depart from the order of the Church is not only the violation of a solemn pledge, but a reflection on the memory of those holy men, as if they had left us a system which needed amendment and reformation. It is a satisfaction to know that no irregularities are practised by the Clergy of this Diocese.

In connexion with this subject, I cannot but express the gratification which I experienced at the order and solemnity which marked the congregations during the recent administration of the sacred rite of confirmation.<sup>1</sup> You, my Reverend Brethren, must have been struck with the apparent devotion, and the earnest attention of the congregations, both of candidates and others, on that solemn occasion—an occasion of much interest to me as the first opportunity of administering the rite since my appointment to this office.

Confirmation has ever been practised in the Christian Church. In this, as in all other cases, the Anglican Church pursues a wise and moderate course between the Church of Rome, on the one hand, by whom this ordinance is exalted into a sacrament, and the Dissenters, on the other hand,

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix Note (A).

by whom it is altogether rejected. The Church of Rome had so overloaded it with her additions that the common people could not distinguish what was ancient from what was modern, what was true from what was false : and Dissenters, going to the other extreme, have set it aside, as though it had been a Romish novelty. The Anglican Church when she was emancipated from the Church of Rome and restored to the primitive pattern, retained this ordinance because it had always been practised in the Church from the Apostolic age. In a certain sense confirmation must be regarded as a Divine Ordinance : not in the same sense as the sacrament of Baptism, and of the supper of the Lord, but yet in such a sense as to make its rejection the rejection of an ordinance of God—on this point, however, I think it necessary to enter upon a fuller explanation. Whatever ceremony or practice can be traced up to the Apostolic age, and also can be proved to have been generally or universally received, must be regarded as an ordinance of God, and is necessarily obligatory on the Christian Church. This position cannot, I conceive, be disputed. We have then the most undoubted testimony that confirmation was practised in the age of the Apostles, and also that it was practised universally in the Church. We have the further testimony,

also, of the most conclusive character, that it was universally practised from the Apostolic age down to the seventeenth century, or at all events to the sixteenth, when it was rejected by a few persons only. Having, therefore, been adopted in the days of the Apostles, who acted in the appointment of rites and ceremonies, under the direct and extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost, it can be regarded in no other light than an ordinance of God. At the same time we do not hold it to be Divine in its appointment in the same sense, as I have just remarked, with the two sacraments. The difference is this : the sacraments were instituted by our blessed Lord himself on earth ; whereas confirmation was appointed by the Apostles, acting under Divine direction.

As I have already intimated, confirmation was never questioned, until the middle of the sixteenth, or commencement of the seventeenth century ; when some persons began to depart from the wise and salutary measures of the Reformation. It is, I think, a sufficient refutation of all the arguments alleged against it by Dissenters, that it was used in the Church from the days of the Apostles ; for we cannot suppose, nay, it would be unreasonable to suppose, that an erroneous practice should have been so long continued, and that the discovery should have been reserved for a few



individuals of no greater wisdom, nor of more exalted piety, than others, of a very recent period.

It is true that the ordinance was mistaken by the Church of Rome ; but that was no reason for disusing it at the Reformation ;—accordingly the Reformers restored the practice to its primitive form, in which state it is still retained by our Church.

“ The Papists,” says a learned writer (NICHOLS), “ had mixed several usages, which were unwarrantable both by Scripture and antiquity,—and those which were ancient they had so superstitiously abused, that it was fitter they should be laid aside.”

The precise age for administering Confirmation is not fixed by the Church : It is stated that it is to be conferred upon parties, when they are *come to years of discretion.* This period is earlier in some young persons than in others ; but as the Church is silent respecting the age, the matter is left entirely to the Bishop. As a general rule, I should consider, that none should be admitted before the age of fourteen ; but I will not say that it should in no case be departed from. The administration of this rite is confined to the Bishop, in accordance with the primitive practice : This point is clearly established by the writings of the Fathers.

It appears to me, that these observations may

serve as our guide to the true use of tradition<sup>2</sup>. When a custom can be traced up, by direct historic testimony, to the Apostolic age, we may rest assured that it was of Apostolic origin ; and, as such, not to be rejected. Such was clearly the view of our Reformers, who discarded all practices, as innovations, which did not bear the stamp of antiquity : By primitive antiquity I mean the first, second, and third centuries. Thus Confirmation ; the substitution of the Lord's Day for the Jewish Sabbath ; Infant Baptism ; and some other things, respecting which there is no absolute command in Holy Scripture, were retained as Apostolic observances. On these points the Scriptures say but little, and it is by inference, and implication, that we arrive at our conclusion. But, connecting Scripture and tradition together, on these points, we are able to determine the questions in such a manner as not to leave room for doubts or cavils. The Church of Rome pleads tradition for all her practices : but for those which are peculiar to her commission she can only ascend to the tenth, ninth, or eighth centuries, when Christianity was greatly corrupted, and when the prevailing darkness was so dense, that any custom, however ridiculous, was easily introduced.

<sup>2</sup> Note (B).



We, therefore, accept tradition as an auxiliary, and in its true sense ; so that any practice, which can be proved, by the same evidence, by which we prove the antiquity of Confirmation, and Infant Baptism, to have been universally practised during the first three centuries, is received by us as an Apostolic usage : but we reject all those to which this text cannot be applied. It is on this ground that the Church of England rejects the practices of the Church of Rome.

With respect to confirmation, the testimony is of such a character, that it cannot be resisted ; and to reject it I deem to be sinful. By members of the Anglican Church, indeed, the practice is not called in question, since to do so would be a virtual rejection of her authority ; but there are times, when it becomes necessary to put forth our views for the sake of others. As Confirmation is received by the Anglican Church, so was it admitted in primitive times. Whatever antiquity the Romish additions may claim, they were not primitive, and must, consequently, be rejected as novelties.

The subject of Church extension in the Colonies is one of overwhelming importance. In England a feeling has been aroused in its favor, which is not likely to be satisfied, until the superabundant population are so far supplied with Church ac-

commodation, that all the people may have the privilege of worshipping God after the manner of their Fathers. Nor is the feeling less powerful in favor of the Colonies; as is evidenced by the zeal, and activity with which the fund for the Colonial Bishoprics has been supported. It must be our aim to create, and cherish, a similar feeling in our own Colony. Some candidates have already presented themselves for ordination: Churches will, I trust, be erected in places where, at present, they do not exist: so that the Church may be extended throughout this extensive Diocese. Our Colonists themselves, I trust, see the importance of this great question. A feeling in favor of Church-extension has, I firmly believe, been kindled in this Colony which will not be extinguished. In support of this view, I need only mention Christ Church in this City, and many Chapels in the Rural Districts, which have been erected at a considerable expense to the proprietors of Estates; an example worthy of all imitation: It is an example, too, which may be mentioned in England, as one, of which we may be justly proud<sup>3</sup>.

When a Bishop addresses his Clergy for the first time, they have a right to expect an exposition of his sentiments on the questions which may,

<sup>3</sup> Note (C).

at the time, be agitated by the public. I shall, therefore, embrace this opportunity of submitting my views to you, my Reverend Brethren, on certain topics of general interest to the Church.

Already I have stated that certain candidates have offered themselves for ordination. Now, this is one of the subjects, respecting which I am anxious to add a few words. Our Church maintains the necessity of Episcopal ordination; for she declares in the preface to the ordination service, that there always have been three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and she further declares, that this point is evident to all men, who diligently read the sacred Scriptures, and ancient authors. To this truth every Clergyman has solemnly subscribed; so that you, my Reverend Brethren, cannot entertain any doubt on this important subject.

Much has been written of late on the question of the Apostolical succession<sup>4</sup> in the Priesthood; but surely the doctrine is maintained in the very passage, to which I have just alluded in the ordination service. It asserts that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, have always existed in the Church; that is, from the Apostles' times, Bishops, in every age, have ordained Priests and Deacons, and thus conveyed the ministerial succession

<sup>4</sup> Note (D).

down to our own days. The Papal succession, and the Apostolical succession, as maintained by the Anglican Church, are very different things. The former is made to depend on the succession of Popes, and this has been so frequently interrupted, that the links cannot be traced. But the latter rests not on so sandy a foundation. I believe, however, that the confounding of these two things, which really have no connexion with each other, has been the source of much of that misapprehension, which has existed on this subject. The doctrine does not depend on our being able to decide who were the Bishops in any See from age to age; but it is sufficient for us that Bishops have, in every age, ordained Priests and Deacons. It would be unreasonable to deny that Bishops governed the Church in primitive times, because all their names are not preserved. It would, in short, be much the same as to deny that Kings governed England at an early period, because some confusion exists respecting their names. Yet this is one of the objections advanced by the opponents of this doctrine. I would, therefore, state the question in the following manner. In every century of the Apostolic age, down to the period of the Reformation, we find a settled ministry governed by Bishops as a separate order. Such was the case until the Reformation, when



some of the German Reformers, from the necessity of their circumstances, as they conceived, regulated the Church without Bishops.

It is no argument against the succession in our ministry to allege that we receive it through the corrupt channel of the Church of Rome. Previous to the Reformation, corrupt as that Church undoubtedly was, there was still a body of faithful people in the land, otherwise it must be admitted that the Church of God had failed. The succession in the ministry was, therefore, preserved, as the succession in the Jewish Priesthood was preserved, during the period that preceded the Advent of our Blessed Lord. At the Reformation the succession existed; and from that time the Church was restored to the state in which she stood prior to the usurpation of Popery. Thus it is acutely remarked, by Bishop JEWEL, "After the same manner we are chosen, invested, informed, admitted: if they were deceived in anything, we succeeded in their place, not in their error." On the principle that everything must be rejected, which has come to us through a corrupt channel, we must reject the sacred volume itself, for the text was preserved, during the dark ages, by the Church of Rome. We must not, therefore, be deterred from maintaining our Apostolic Commission, either by those who argue that it has been



transmitted through a corrupt channel, or by those who exalt it beyond those bounds which are fixed by the Anglican Church.

As Ministers of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, you will feel it to be your duty and your privilege, not only to minister to your congregations in the Church, but also to undertake the superintendence of the education of the rising generation. Our Schools<sup>5</sup> are of the utmost importance to the temporal and spiritual welfare, and I trust that we shall not be checked in at least retaining our present Schools, if not in extending the blessings of a Christian education to all the children of the Diocese. It is not only the policy, but the duty, of a Christian State, to afford the means of Christian education to all its subjects. I say a Christian education, in contradistinction to that system which has been adopted in Ireland.

Before I quit the subject of education, I may refer to the College, or Grammar School, which is now in contemplation. We have had our schools for the children of the poor, but what serious inconveniencies have been experienced by those in the higher walks of life? Education is scarcely to be obtained, and many have been constrained to send their children to England, who, had the means been afforded, would have retained them

<sup>5</sup> Note (E).

in the Colony, while others, who have not been able to do this, have unhappily seen their children grow up without those advantages, so essential to the maintenance of their position in society. My hope is, that the Institution will meet all the wants of this portion of our population. I also indulge the hope that this Institution may, in future years, supply many candidates for the ministry of the Church. In short, the benefits, which may result from such an establishment, cannot be calculated.

You are aware, my Reverend Brethren, that, within the last two years, I have spent a considerable time in England, where I have not been unobservant of those questions, by which the public mind is agitated. As some of these questions are as applicable to the Colonies, as to Mother Country, I may reasonably be expected to allude to them on this occasion.

Believing, as I do, that some of the statements put forth in the Tracts for the Times, and which have attracted so much attention in England, have had an injurious tendency, I cannot, nevertheless, concur in those indiscriminate censures which are heaped upon these publications, as if, because they are in error on some, they must necessarily be so on all, points. My opinion is, that injudicious and unreasonable attacks

always encourage the evil, whatever it may be. My own observations have made it clear to my own mind, that mischief has arisen from the mode in which some of the opponents of these Tracts have carried on their warfare. For instance, they do not hesitate to stigmatise, with a name of reproach, many Clergymen, who, without reference to the Tracts, have consistently fulfilled their ordination vows, by complying with the requirements of the Church, as expressed in her *Rubrics and Canons*. By many persons, whose zeal is greater than their discretion, such individuals have been charged with Popery, for no other reason than this, that they are scrupulous in attending to the injunctions of the Church. With some persons in England, it is a sufficient argument against a practice, that it is recommended in these publications. Such a course is unreasonable, and injurious to the cause of truth. *We* are not, however, to be influenced by such considerations. While, therefore, I concur in opinion with many of my Right Reverend Brethren in England, in regretting certain things which have appeared in these publications, I cannot join in that indiscriminate censure, which is heaped upon them by persons, who, in many cases, have not read the books which they condemn, and who, consequently, cannot understand the questions which they undertake to discuss.



With regard to the principle laid down in Tract 90, respecting the interpretation of the articles, there is, I believe, but one opinion among sound Churchmen, namely, that it has a most dangerous tendency. That the articles of the Anglican Church can be reconciled with the decisions of the Council of Trent, is a position so fatal, that it is impossible not to regret deeply that it has ever been advanced. Against the principle, therefore, attempted to be established in the Tract, I must, in conjunction with many of my Right Reverend Brethren in England, whose objections are now before the public, unhesitatingly declare, that I view it as opposed to the very foundation on which the Anglican Church rests.

Nor can I concur in the notion that any reserve should be maintained in preaching the great doctrine of the Gospel, the doctrine of the atonement. This fundamental article of the Christian faith is to be stated fully, clearly, unreservedly—it is so stated in Holy Scripture—it is so stated by the Church. But, whilst I thus give my own opinion, as silence on this point might be misunderstood, I must, in justice to the writer to whom these remarks apply, state, on the authority of a Right Reverend Prelate in England<sup>6</sup>, that the talented and pious writer has himself “publicly disclaimed the meaning imputed to him, and

<sup>6</sup> Note (F).

has denied that it could be fairly inferred from his language.

It is not necessary to specify all the points on which I conceive that the writers have exceeded the fair limits of interpretation, both as regards doctrine and practice. Among the latter, the revival of certain primitive customs or ceremonies are recommended : but our rule, my Reverend Brethren, is the rule of our own Church. No other rites and ceremonies are to be adopted than those which the Church enjoins. Comparative antiquity may undoubtedly be pleaded for many practices : but none of those which are rejected by our Reformers were truly primitive—it is not sufficient that a practice was common in the ninth or tenth century, the Church of England adopts those only which were universal during the first three. I conceive that all truly primitive practices are retained in our formularies, and that man is as much a Dissenter who goes beyond the rule, as he who falls short of it. With any practices not enjoined by our Church, we have no concern whatever.

Having thus delivered my sentiments respecting the *Tracts for the Times*, I may direct your attention to a subject which is quite unconnected with these publications, though by some persons it is made a part of the system of these writers.



I refer to your subscription to the Book of Common Prayer, and the consequent obligation to comply with all its requirements. It must be borne in mind, that the Rubrics and the Calendar are as much a part of the Book to which we subscribe, as the various services. It is the entire volume to which we subscribe. And to what does that subscription bind us? To me it is obvious that the former is so explicit, that no Clergyman can, consistently with his pledge, violate any of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer. The article in the 36th Canon, and the Declaration of Assent and Consent in the Act of Uniformity, are so unambiguous, that no man can mistake their meaning: consequently every one who subscribes is under an obligation to comply. A man, for example, who holds a living on the strength of his subscription, cannot conscientiously retain it, if he feels unable to comply with the requirements of the Church. I feel bound, therefore, to state, that I look upon strict conformity to the Rubrics as absolutely necessary. You are pledged to conform: and I, as your Diocesan, am equally pledged to see that the intentions of the Church are fulfilled. It is our duty to adopt that course which the Church enjoins, uninfluenced by the charge of Popery

<sup>7</sup> Note (G).

on the one hand, or by that of Puritanism on the other. No Clergyman can plead that his conscience does not allow of compliance: I mean that he cannot use this plea, and yet remain within the pale of the Church: for, if he entertains scruples, his obvious duty is, not to violate his pledges by omissions, or mutilations, or irregularities; but to renounce his preferment. Of course these remarks refer more especially to incumbents, since the Bishop can withdraw a Curate's licence, on the fact of his irregular conduct being made known.

Feeling that this subject is one of much importance, I cannot but press it upon your attention on this my first opportunity of meeting you: not that I suspect any of the Clergy of this Diocese of irregularities, but as others will, from time to time, be added to your number, it is desirable that my intentions and wishes may be made public, in order that no one may plead ignorance.

My Reverend Brethren,

It is my wish, whenever circumstances permit, that the offertory<sup>s</sup> should be used, and a collection made every Lord's Day. At all events, it will be easy, where collections are made, to make them from seat to seat during the reading of the sentences. Of course the service, when there is

no Communion; will be concluded with the Prayer for the Church Militant, and one or more of the Collects, at the end of the Communion Service.

In the Apostolic age, and also during several succeeding centuries, it was the custom to communicate every Lord's Day, and on these occasions the faithful made their offerings: Thus St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, enjoins, "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."—xvi, 1 Cor. 3. Both these facts, namely, the weekly Communion, and the consequent oblations, are confirmed by the testimony of ecclesiastical history<sup>9</sup>: it was also enjoined by the Apostolical constitutions, that the offerings should be made every Lord's day<sup>10</sup>. For some time the Agapæ, or *Love Feasts*, were held at the same time; but in consequence of being abused, they were abolished.

Still the *Lord's Supper* was administered, and the obligations received: Thus it is remarked by a learned writer, alluding to the discontinuance of the *Love Feasts*, "Where they were so, though the Sacrament had nothing but of religious import, yet the eleemosynary oblations still continued, for JUSTIN MARTYR tells us, 'They that are well to pass, if they are so disposed, every man

<sup>9</sup> Note (I). <sup>10</sup> Note (K).



as he pleaseth, offereth somewhat of that he hath.”<sup>11</sup> Many other testimonies are adduced by the same learned writer. After some centuries, as errors crept into the Church, the Communion was less frequently celebrated, but there is reason to believe that the alms of the people were still collected on the Lord’s Day.

At the Reformation, it was intended to revive the early practice of the weekly celebration of the Eucharist, and until very lately the custom was observed in several churches in London, besides St. Paul’s, where it is still continued. But it is clear that the Reformers intended that the weekly collection should be made, whether there was a Communion or not. This is the first Liturgy of King Edward—A.D., 1549. The offertory was appointed to be read before the congregation dispersed, and then, those who intended to communicate, remained. The offerings were made, while all the congregation were assembled: and the Communion was administered after the Non-Communicants had withdrawn. This fact is decisive of the views of the Reformers—it shews that they intended that all the congregation should contribute their offerings. The Rubric to which I have alluded stands thus: “While the clerks do sing the offertory, so many as are

<sup>11</sup> Note (L).

disposed shall offer to the poor man's box—then, so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall tarry still in the quire, &c. All others that mind not to receive shall depart," &c. Nor does our present service contravene this practice—on the contrary, it positively supports the view, which I have taken, namely, [that the oblations should be made *every* Sunday, by *all* the people.] Thus the *Rubric*, at the end of the offertory, enjoins, "While these sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, &c., shall receive the alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people, &c." This is to be done whether there is a Communion or not; for the very next *Rubric* enjoins, "When there is a Communion, &c.," evidently showing that the alms of the people are always to be collected without reference to the Eucharist.

And now, my Reverend Brethren, having stated my views on this subject, I may remark, that I merely wish to revive the weekly oblations, according to the intention of the Reformers, whether the Holy Communion will, or will not, be celebrated. You will, I am sure, agree with me, that the practice is sanctioned by the Church; and I am convinced that you will concur with me in opinion, that it would be productive of much good in this Diocese. By the revival of the ancient custom,



we should be supplied with a fund, from which the wants of the Church might be very materially relieved. Nor can I believe that the Laity would not cheerfully embrace the opportunity of making a weekly contribution, out of the means which the Lord has bestowed. I do not wish, my Reverend Brethren, to enjoin the practice, but I commend it to your serious consideration, and having made known my own wishes and feelings, I am confident that unless some sufficient reason can be alleged, you will not be backward to introduce the practice, as the circumstances of your respective parishes may permit.

After what I have said respecting subscription, I need scarcely enter into particular observances. Still it may be observed, that a Clergyman, who feels himself bound by his solemn engagements, as every conscientious person must, will read the services without mutilation, or omission, or alteration. There is a point, however, connected with the lessons, upon which I would dwell for a few minutes. I refer to the lessons from the Apocryphal books, which are never read on Sundays, but only on some Saints days, and for about two months in the year, during the daily service. Some Clergymen scruple to read such lessons; but the Church does not allow

the Clergy to change one for another. The subject should be considered before ordination. But I confess that I cannot understand such scruples : for it appears to me a much more weighty affair for an individual to violate his engagement by changing a lesson, than to read a chapter from the Apocrypha ; a practice settled by the Reformers,—men who went to the stake in defence of their principles. The occasional services also must be used throughout. I cannot understand how any Clergyman can experience any relief from his scruples by irregularities : for whether he reads the Apocryphal lesson or not, or whether he reads the whole of the occasional services or omits portions, he still declares his assent even to the omissions : consequently, to obtain the relief which he seeks, he ought to quit the Church altogether. The Church, too, is less injured by the secession of men who cannot fulfil their solemn pledges, than by the continuance of those who pursue an irregular course within her pale.

The administration of the Sacrament of Baptism<sup>12</sup> is appointed to take place in the presence of the congregation. In many Churches in England, there is a return to the ancient practice : and I am convinced that the congregation would soon become interested, especially if the Church em-

<sup>12</sup> Note (M).

braced such opportunities to explain the nature of this Holy Sacrament. Baptism was never intended to be administered before the congregation assembles, or after it is dispersed.

In all cases of doubt, the Church has given direction that the Bishop should be consulted. Should a Clergyman entertain a doubt respecting the force of a Rubric, or respecting the validity of any practice, he is required to refer the case to the Bishop, who has authority to decide. Should the Bishop hesitate to decide, the case is to be referred to the Archbishop. But the decision of either becomes binding, for it possesses the force of a Rubric. I need scarcely say that I shall be most willing to aid any of my Reverend Brethren in their doubts or difficulties, and solve the one, and arrange the other, according to the best of my judgment. What I shall labour to see established throughout this Diocese, is uniformity in practice. This will easily be attained, if all doubtful points are submitted to the Bishop, in accordance with the Rubric.

Before I close, I must allude to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the Church Missionary Society. To the former, we are deeply indebted for its exertions in spreading the light of the Gospel in this Colony. The latter has so far modified its institution, as



to allow His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to become its President, a post which he could not have undertaken prior to the change to which I allude. According to the arrangement entered into with his Grace, those Clergymen who are sent into the Colonies by that Society, are to be subject to the Colonial Bishops, just in the same manner as the other Clergy. Should any difference arise between the Colonial Bishop and the local committee, the case is to be referred to the Archbishop, whose decision is to be final. In this arrangement, I most cordially concur. At the same time I am anxious to express my views of the compact entered into with the Archbishop. In accordance with that compact, I shall expect the Clergy in this Colony, who may be connected with the Church Missionary Society, to render the same canonical obedience to their Ordinary, as is paid by their brethren. I am sure, too, that such is the feeling of the committee in London. In all matters connected with the exercise of their clerical functions, it will be their duty,—and I feel that I need not dwell upon this in the presence of that excellent Clergyman who has, for so long a period, served the Society in all faithfulness, sobriety, and zeal, and at the same time merited the approval of his Bishop,—to consult their Diocesan, and not the local committee, who have no right



to interfere, except in such matters as do not properly fall under Episcopal cognizance. Having entered into an explanation of my views on this question, in order that no misapprehension may hereafter exist, I must express my sincere desire to co-operate with the Society, and to promote its objects in every possible manner.

And now, my Reverend Brethren, I commit you to the Lord, and to the word of His Grace. A most important charge is entrusted to you. Having been set apart to the sacred office of the ministry by the imposition of hands by those, who have received the power in succession from the Apostles of our Lord, you are Ambassadors for Christ; and it is your duty to beseech men to be reconciled unto God. My own responsibilities I feel most deeply: yet I trust that we shall all persevere in our course, relying on the arm of Him, who is able to keep us from falling. As servants of the Anglican Church we must view her as the pillar and ground of the truth in this distant Colony. In England she has been the bulwark of the truth: and at the present moment there is a combination formed against her of the most heterogenous description. It is one obvious duty in this distant land to maintain the Church in her dignity. Viewing her as a blessing to the Colony, it will be our duty to extend her influence

in every direction, until all the inhabitants may have the privilege of attending public worship. Be ready, then, my Reverend Brethren, to preach the word: be instant in season and out of season: reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine: do the work of an Evangelist: make full proof of your ministry: and may the Holy Spirit enable you to fulfil those arduous duties, which belong to you as ministers of Christ's Holy Catholic Church!

# APPENDIX.

331	721	34
38	22	45
2	41	7
25	11	21
221	221	
102	64	17

## NOTE (A).

See NICHOLS in Loco. The question relative to the reception of practices which have been abused by the Church of Rome, is well answered in the following note, which I have extracted from the History of the Convocation, by the Rev. T. Lathbury, a work of much research :—" James, with the good sense which, notwithstanding his pedantry, marked much of his conversation, replied to Rainolds, at the Hampton Court conference, that the abuse of the sign of the Cross in the time of Popery, was an evidence that it was not abused before the time of Popery. By such an argument he intended that the Trinity might be renounced, since it was abused in the time of Popery. Turning to Rainolds, His Majesty said, " They used to wear hose and shoes in Popery, therefore you shall now go barefoot." If, indeed, everything must be rejected which has come to us through the Church of Rome, we should be compelled to reject the Scriptures: for during the dark ages, the Sacred Text was preserved by that Church. This argument is admirably put by Whitgift in his reply to Cartwright, respecting confirmation. Cartwright contended for giving it up altogether, in consequence of the abuse. Whitgift answered the objection as follows : " If that be a sufficient reason to abolishe it, bycause it hathe bene horribly abused, then what shall you reteyn, either in the Churche, or in the common lyfe of man ? But I have before, in talking of apparell, declared the vanitie of this reason : and yet the confirmation that is nowe used was never abused by the Papistes, for they had it not, neyther any similitude of it, but only the name, which cannot contaminate the thing." Whitgifts defence, 1594, p. 726.



The following are the numbers admitted to the sacred rite of Confirmation in my late tour :—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
St. George—Cathedral, . . . . .	38	127	165
„ St. James the Less, . . . . .	10	23	33
St. Matthew—Parish Church, . . . . .	7	18	25
„ Craig Chapel, . . . . .	12	41	53
St. Paul—Parish Church, . . . . .	64	126	190
„ St. Augustine's, . . . . .	74	130	204
„ Enmore Chapel, . . . . .	75	169	244
St. Swithin—Parish Church, . . . . .	60	146	206
„ St. Thomas' Chapel, . . . . .	10	13	23
St. Luke—St. Stephen's Chapel, . . . . .	85	95	180
St. Peter—Parish Church, . . . . .	169	306	475
St. John—Parish Church, . . . . .	63	102	165
„ St. Paul's Chapel, } . . . . .			
„ St. Peter's Chapel, . . . . .	10	24	34
„ Westfield Chapel, . . . . .	7	36	43
Trinity—Parish Church, . . . . .	78	153	231
„ St. Saviour's Chapel, . . . . .	30	68	98
„ St. Barnabas' Chapel, . . . . .	21	48	69
„ St. Matthias' (Pomeroon), . . . . .	21	23	44
„ Caledonia (Pomeroon), . . . . .	10	22	32
St. Michael—Parish Church, . . . . .	32	64	96
„ St. Alban's Chapel, . . . . .	27	50	77
All Saints—Parish Church, . . . . .	25	61	86
„ All Souls' Chapel, . . . . .	21	31	52
St. Saviour—St. Mary's Chapel, . . . . .	28	22	50
„ St. Margaret's Chapel, . . . . .	23	13	36
St. Patrick—Parish Church, . . . . .	179	242	421
Total, . . . . .	1179	2153	3332

#### NOTE (B.)

The following extract on Tradition, from a writer of the time of James I. and Charles I., will be read with interest. “The fourth kind of Tradition is the continued practice of such things, as neither are contained in the Scriptures expressly, nor the examples of such practice expressly there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice be there contained, and the benefit or good that followeth of it. Of this sort is the Baptism of



Infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture. Yet is not this so received by bare and naked Tradition, but that we find the Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it. Of this sort is the observation of the Lord's Day, the precept whereof is not found in Scripture, though the practice be." The same able writer gives the following rules by which genuine Tradition may be distinguished from counterfeit. "The first rule is delivered by Augustine—*Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum, non nisi auctoritate Apostolicâ traditum rectissimè creditur.*—*Whatever the whole Church holdeth, not being decreed by the authority of Councils, but having been ever holden, may rightly be thought, to have proceeded from Apostolic authority.* The second rule is, whatever all, or the most famous and renowned, in all ages, or at the least in divers ages, have constantly delivered, as received from them that went before them, no man contradicting or doubting of it, may be thought to be an Apostolical tradition. The third rule is, the constant testimony of the Pastors of an Apostolic Church, successively delivered."—Field on the Church—Book iv., PP. 365, 7. 8. By these rules, the various ordinances of the Anglican Church may be tried: and it will be found that they are applicable to all the practices, which we retain.

## NOTE (C.)

The subjoined list exhibits the state of the Diocese of Guiana, as accurately as it can be obtained :—

	Deanery of Demerara.	Deanery of Essequibo.	Deanery of Berbice.	Total.
Churches and Chapels, . . .	10	20	10	40
Number of Sittings, . . .	9,100	5,399	4,430	18,929
Number of Attendance at the Holy Communion, . . .	2,942	1,589	600	5,131
Ditto at National Schools, . .	1,143	808	903	2,854
Ditto at Infant Schools, . . .	194	"	"	194
Ditto at Evening Schools, . .	74	60	155	289
Ditto at Estates' Schools, . .	26	233	27	286
Ditto at Sunday Schools, . .	1,142	608	570	2,120
Aggregate Amount of Attendance at all the Schools, . . .	2,579	1,709	1,655	5,943
Number of Schools, . . .	22	23	24	69
Contributions to Churches and Schools by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, from funds placed in his hands by Societies in connexion with the Church, from 1836 to 1842, inclusive, . . .	£ Stg. 3,445	£. 4,550	£. 3,275	£. 11,270
Ditto by Church Missionary Society, . . . . .	"	5,000	"	5,000
Ditto by Private Individuals in the Colony, . . . . .	16,115	4,320	4,460	24,895
Ditto by the Colony, . . . .	20,676	2,810	9,000	32,486
Annual Contributions by the Lord Bishop towards Salaries of Clergy, . . . . .	500	700	400	1,600
Ditto to Readers, Catechists, &c., . . . . .	932	1,168	591	2,691
Ditto by Church Missionary Society, . . . . .	"	2,200	"	2,200
Ditto by Private Individuals, Ditto by the Colony towards Salaries of Clergy, Catechists, and Schoolmasters, . . .	500	250	260	1,010
Ditto by the Colony towards House-Rent of Clergy, . . .	3,374	2,240	2,300	7,914
	540	390	390	1,320

## NOTE (D.)

It has been stated in the Charge, that the succession in the Ministry is in no way effected by the corruptions of the Church of Rome. On this point, our Reformers, and their immediate successors, entertained no doubt whatever. The Reformers argued that the Church of England had not separated from the Church, but only from the Papacy. They asserted that the Church was under the Papacy, but that the Papacy was not the Church. It was further argued, that, notwithstanding the corruption of the Church prior to the Reformation, there were numbers of holy and learned men, who held the truth—nor was it until the period of the Council of Trent, that many of the present errors of Rome were made Articles of Faith. Carlton, Field, Hooker, and other writers of the bright period of James I., proved, in their valuable works, that the Anglican Church had separated only from Rome, so far as the Romish Court had separated itself from the ancient Roman Church. In short, we have not received the succession from Rome, but from the same source whence she herself received it. The fact of Rome's usurpation, for a time, over the Church of England, is no argument against the succession. When the Reformation was effected; it was merely a casting off of that usurpation. We had then our Bishops, who, though they had been subjected to Rome, were free to act independently of the Pope, and who actually continued and preserved the succession in the Church. Even Baxter, though a non-conformist, speaks of Bishops that have oversight of many Churches, as lawful successors of the Apostles. In his Church History, P. 23, is this strong testimony—"The Churches began this so early, and received it so universally, and without any considerable dissent or opposition, even before Emperors became Christians, that I dare not be one that shall set against it, or dishonour such Episcopacy."

On the objection sometimes raised against our Orders, on the ground of the channel, through which, occasionally, they have been transmitted, the following extracts from Bishop JEWEL may be regarded as appropriate:—He argues, that separation from Rome was not a separation from the Church,



and that the Ordinances, which we observe, are those of the Primitive Church. "We have forsaken the Church, as it is now, not as it was in old times past, and have so gone from it, as Daniel went out of the Lion's den, and the three children out of the furnace."—The Apology, Part v., Chap xv., Dio 4. Again, "We have departed from that Church, which we ourselves did evidently see with our eyes, to have gone from the Holy Fathers, and from the Holy Apostles, from Christ himself, and from the Primitive and Catholic Church of God. And we are come as near as we possibly could, to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers : which Church, we know, was sound and perfect, and as Tutullian termeth it, a *Pure Virgin*, and we have directed, according to the customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the Sacraments, and the form of Common Prayer. We have called home again to the original and first foundation, that Religion which hath been foully neglected, and utterly corrupted. For we thought it meet thence to take the pattern of reforming Religion, from whence the ground of Religion was first taken ; because this one reason, as with the most ancient Father *Tutullian*, hath great force against all heresies : look whatsoever was first, that is true : and whatsoever is later, that is corrupt."—Apology, Part vi., Chap. xvi., Dio i. ii. With respect to the succession in our Ministry, I have shown that it stands quite independent of Rome : for when the Papal usurpation was cast off at the Reformation, our succession of Bishops, which had been continued from the Apostles' times, through ages which were more or less corrupt, was no more broken, than the succession of our Kings by the usurpation of the Long Parliament, or of Cromwell. From the first introduction of the Gospel into England, there have been Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in the Church, the Bishops conveying the succession from age to age : and the fact of subjection to Rome did not in any way affect the transmission of orders. The various orders in the Ministry had always been retained in the Anglican Church : consequently the transmission never depended on the Papal See, even though it usurped a power over the Church and the Country. Thus it is argued by a



learned Prelate, one of the ornaments of our Church in the time of James I., “ We hold ordination and succession even from the Apostles: albeit our succession be not from the Church of Rome, nor by that Church, yet we hold it sure, and that not without the testimony of that Church.”—*Carlton's Directions to know the True Church, Pref.* Two points were constantly held by the Reformers and their successors in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., and also by our great Divines subsequent to the Restoration in 1660, namely, that our orders were derived from the Apostles independently of the Papacy, and that any corruptions in the Church did not destroy its character.

NOTE (E.)

For the School Statistics, see above Note (C.)

NOTE (F.)

Bishop of St. David's Charge.—Rivingtons : 1842.

NOTE (G.)

Whilst the Charge was in the Press, I was favoured with the sight of “ A Letter on the use of the Offertory,” by the Rev. R. Seymour.—Rivingtons : 1843. The following extract, says the author, is taken from a Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of New Jersey, who, after recommending to his Clergy that, instead of monthly, or at rarer intervals, as had been the previous practice, the Offerings at the Church be made every Lord's Day, in connexion with the Offertory, proceeds thus :—  
“ I. This was the primitive mode. II. This is the simplest and most direct address that can be made to the parishioners. III. This is the Church's proper action, in her due organization under the direction of her ministers, on the call of her Divine Head.

This plan combines many advantages.

1. Its *frequency* is an advantage. The contribution can never be forgotten.

2. Its *constancy* is an advantage. The supply from it will be perpetual and sure. There is nothing to be trusted like a *habit*.

3. Its *simplicity* is an advantage. It is intelligible by every one, and will commend itself even to little children.

4. Its *moderation* is an advantage. Returning frequently, it of course calls, at each time, for comparatively little. Thus it meets the convenience of all. "If thou hast much, give plenteously; if thou hast little, do thy diligence gladly to give of that little."

5. Its *inexpensiveness* is an advantage. It will cost nothing for agencies, and be encumbered with no officers.

6. Its *sobriety* is an advantage. It makes no exciting appeals, and creates no heat, to be followed by a more than corresponding coldness. It is the oozing of the water from the rock that fills the springs. It is the gentle drooping of the dew that clothes the vales with verdure."

#### NOTE (H.)

See Bingham—Vol. v., PP. 347, 351—for many testimonies on this point. Ed. 1840. Straker.

#### NOTE (I.)

L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices—P. 178.

#### NOTE (K.)

L'Estrange—P. 178.

#### NOTE (L.)

There can be no question that every Clergyman is pledged to a strict conformity: and though in some particulars it may be the custom to depart slightly from the *Rubric*, yet such irregularities cannot justify any Clergyman in other irregular courses. Indeed, our obvious duty is to relinquish such practices, if any exist, and return to the course enjoined by the Church. One irregularity, at least one which is practised in some Churches in England, may be specified. I allude to the change of Lessons, and especially the substitution of a Lesson from the Old Testament for an Apocryphal Chapter. That such a practice is a violation of the solemn engagements into which the Clergy enter, will be evident to every candid person who reads the following passage from the History of the Convocation, P.P. 170. 1. 2. :—

"It has been argued from this clause, that a discretionary

power is vested in the clergy to change the lessons at pleasure. A few remarks, therefore, on this point are necessary.

In King Edward's Liturgies there were no proper lessons for Sundays ; but the chapters were read in succession, as is still the case in our daily services. It is clear that the *admonition* was written before the publication of the Book in 1563, when proper lessons for Sundays and holidays had not been fixed. In the Book of Common Prayer, as revised under Queen Elizabeth, proper lessons are appointed ; and as the book was established by parliament, the lessons were sanctioned by the same authority ; consequently, even at that time, no clergyman could take upon himself to change them, because the act of parliament was of greater obligation than the *admonition*. The *admonition* was intended to grant a liberty to the clergy after the queen's accession before proper lessons were appointed ; and it is singular that it was not suppressed when the defect was supplied. It is ordered by the Act of Uniformity, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, that the Book of Common Prayer was to be used "in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book, so authorized by parliament in the said fifth and sixth year of the reign of King Edward VI., with one alteration, or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year." The *admonition* could not be pleaded against the *act*. The very words of the *admonition*, "where it may so chance some one or other chapter of the Old Testament to fall," prove that it refers to the period before the *act*, when the chapters were taken in order. They could not refer to the period subsequent to the *act*, when lessons were fixed for Sundays, and therefore could not be said to *chance to fall*\*.

\* Strype observes, "By which passage it may seem that this *admonition*, and consequently the whole second book, was wrote and finished before the queen's first parliament ; for in the Act of Uniformity then made this was then provided for, and the alteration of the lessons for the Sundays, as it was in the old Common Prayer Book, is taken notice of in that act, as one of the alterations confirmed by that act ; so that I wonder that clause was not left out of the *admonition*, printed after the Sunday lessons were corrected."—STRYPE's *Annals*, i., 2, 105.



But the case is still clearer since the last Act of Uniformity. The Calendar and Tables of Lessons are a part of the Book of Common Prayer : consequently they are enjoined by act of parliament, and no royal injunction, even were it to be issued now, could overturn an act of parliament. It seems strange, therefore, that clergymen should plead the admonition : and it is clear, that the men who do so are unacquainted with the whole question. The following *rubrical* directions occur in "*the order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read,*" namely : "*The Old Testament is appointed for the first lessons at morning and evening prayer. The New Testament is appointed for the second lessons at morning and evening prayer.*" Now, the *admonition* did not, even when it was in force, authorize the substitution of one chapter of the *Old Testament* for another, but the substitution of one from the *New Testament* for one from the *Old* : so that the parties who plead the admonition violate their own principle, unless they read a chapter from the *New Testament*, and in such cases two chapters from the *New* would be read, and not one from the *Old*. But the Church expressly declares, that a chapter from the Old Testament shall be read at every service. In short, the practice is altogether indefensible : and I should not have noticed the subject, had I not been aware that there are clergymen, who, from total ignorance of the question, choose to plead the authority of the admonition."

#### NOTE (M.)

I did not enter into the question of Lay Baptism in the body of the Charge, but as it has recently excited much attention in England, I would allude to it in a note. But, perhaps the purpose may be answered by the following extract from a work, to which I have previously referred :—

"Though the Church of England has not synodically declared against the validity of *lay-baptism*, yet she never gave any countenance to baptism by those who dissented from her communion. A case occurred in the Court of Arches, in 1841, in which the court decided that dissenting baptism was the same as lay-baptism, against which the Church has not decided.



It is said, therefore, that the Church allows of *lay baptism*. In the early Church, undoubtedly, it was allowed in cases of necessity. Many testimonies on this head are given by Bingham. The *rubrics* in the *first* and *second* books of King Edward, and also in that of Queen Elizabeth, leave the matter doubtful. The persons present were to call upon God, and one of them was to dip the child in water. In consequence of this *rubric*, *laymen*, and even *midwives*, did sometimes, in cases of danger, administer the sacred rite : and such *baptism* was not disallowed. At the period of the Hampton Court conference, there was a doubt whether *laymen* were allowed to baptize : so that it is evident that the practice was not then continued. The King remarked, " If called private from the place, I think it agreeable with the use of the primitive Church : but if termed private, that any besides a lawful minister may baptize, I utterly dislike it." The Archbishop of Canterbury argued that it was not allowed by the Church : but the king replied, that the *rubric* must intend to give permission to private persons to baptize. The Bishop of Worcester said, that the compilers of the book did not so intend : and the Bishop of London stated that they intended to allow it, in cases of necessity. The Bishop of Worcester added, that the compilers propounded the words ambiguously, because, otherwise, the book might not have been sanctioned by the parliament.\*

But it can scarcely be said that the *rubrics* sanctioned the practice, for they must be interpreted by the Articles : and the Twenty-third declares, that it is not lawful for any one to take upon himself to preach and minister the *sacraments*. By this article, therefore, a *layman* was no more at liberty to administer one sacrament than the other. But in the year 1575, the convocation, as has been previously stated, declared that the sense of the Church was against the practice : and in 1604, when the *revised* Book of Common Prayer was published, the question was set at rest by an alteration of the *rubric*, by which the administration of the rite is confined to *lawful ministers*. It is singular too, that at the Hampton Court conference, the

\* BARTON'S *Account of the Conference*. FULLER, x.

Puritans argued against *baptism by laymen*. It is clear, therefore, that the *rubrics*, in the old Books of Common Prayer, were not always interpreted so as to countenance *lay-baptism*. At the same time that the practice existed there can be no doubt whatever : and when once it had been administered, no matter by whom, the rite was not to be repeated.

It is argued by some, that though the Church discourages *lay-baptism*, she does not pronounce it null and void.\* But this argument is not satisfactory : for by the alteration of the *rubric*, and the substitution of the words *lawful minister*, the Church has surely declared against the practice, even though she has not put forth a public declaration on the subject. The catechism too, seems to confirm this position : for it declares that the sacraments are only *generally necessary to salvation*, not *essentially necessary*. Consequently, in the judgment of the Church of England, *baptism* is not *absolutely* necessary to salvation, but only *generally* necessary, as a duty, whenever it can be properly administered by a lawful minister, according to the *rubric*.

But this question of *lay-baptism* is totally different from that of *baptism* by dissenters. It is admitted, and must be admitted, that the Church never sanctioned the practice except in cases of absolute necessity. How then can necessity be pleaded in the case of dissenters ? In the cases in which it was allowed by the Church, the rite was administered in a private chamber, when the child was in danger, and a clergyman could not be procured : whereas, dissenting *baptism* is publicly administered to children in health, and in places where the ministers of the Church are ready to administer that sacrament as often as they are called upon to do so. It may be marked, that the dissenter argues that *his baptism* is as valid as our own. The parties, however, who wish to place *dissenting* on the same footing with *lay-baptism*, are members of the Church of England.

There is another consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of in this matter. It is this : the *baptism* by laymen in England, subsequent to the Reformation, was still administer-

ed by the members of the Church, not by persons in a state of separation. Though, therefore, the Church did, in cases of necessity, admit of *lay-baptism*, she never could have contemplated *baptism* by dissenters: for the parties who performed it were her own members. This is a point of great importance in the controversy. In the case of *lay-baptism*, as formerly allowed, its validity rested, not on any supposed right of the person to baptize, but on the authority of the ecclesiastical governors, who permitted the practice. I am aware, that, by the decisions in the Court of Arches, a clergyman is bound to read the funeral service over persons who have been baptized by dissenters: but this is quite a different question, and in no way affects the other question, whether the Church admits the validity of baptism when so administered. The law of the land may impose a duty on the ministers of the Church, and they readily perform the duty: but it by no means follows from this circumstance, that the Church recognizes *dissenting* as *valid baptism*.—HIST. OF CONVOCATION, P. P. 346—9.

### ERRATA.

Page 9, 5th line from the bottom of page, for commission, read *communion*.

Page 16, 6th line, 2nd paragraph, for as to Mother Church, read *as to the Mother Church*.

Page 24, 6th line from bottom of page, for will or will not be, read *be or be not*.

Page 26, last line, for Church, read *Clergy*.

Page 29, 4th line from bottom of page, for one read *our*.

„ Last line but one, for dignity, read *integrity*.

In Appendix, page 36, for Tutullian, read *Tertullian*.



